

In re Application of  
Masaki Morimatsu  
Takeo Ito

App. No.: 09/723016  
Filed: November 27, 2000  
Conf. No.: 5642  
Title: COMPONENT OF A ROTATING  
ELECTRICAL MACHINE  
Examiner: K. Addison  
Art Unit: 2834

**REQUEST FOR REHEARING**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Arlington, VA 22313-1450

Appellant respectfully requests either a rehearing in this appeal, or preferably a reconsideration of the Board's Decision dated July 28, 2006, to present certain evidence, as set out below, to rebut the definition of the terms "integral" and "molded" as raised by the Board during the Oral Hearing on July 11, 2006 and relied upon in its decision.

Quite frankly, the undersigned was taken aback by the apparent definitions of these terms raised during the hearing. The undersigned, who served nearly 4 years as an Examiner and who has been prosecuting cases for many years since then considered something as being "integral" if its disassembly of the connected components could not be accomplished without destroying the connection between them. As such, a bolted or snapped together construction would not be an "integral connection". Attached hereto as an exhibit made from the Classification Manual" of the Office which are believed to substantiate this definition and rebut the one apparently applied by the Board in its decision. This is not a complete listing of the examples, but does show the consistency of the undersigned's definition.

Also Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines "integral" as "formed as a unit with another part".

Performing the integration by molding, as recited, for example in claim 4, is an even more permanent method of integration in that destruction of at least a portion of the molded body must occur to effect disassembly. This is not true with the alleged anticipatory reference.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler  
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182  
Pacific Time

Attachment: Selected quotes from the Manual of Classification